

Reauthorization Committee of Colorado Council of Deans of Education (CCODE)
September 4, 2008

In attendance:

Carolyn Edwards, Bob Fulton, Nella Bea Anderson, Jennie Whitcomb, Sara Dallman, Suzie Perry, Ian K. Macgillivray, Jami Goetz, Julie Carnahan, Vicki Leal, Jeanette Cornier, & Ken Turner.

Topics that were brought up at the previous meeting:

- 1) Input vs. Output Model
 - Current state approval/reapproval process is more input based, cumbersome
 - Is it possible for institutions of higher education (IHEs) to partner with one another?
 - Would prefer a more meaningful process to build quality and capacity
 - Regulation vs. Innovation
- 2) How do NCATE's and TEAC's processes "fit" with CDE/DHE process?
 - Why should we do approval when a large % of Colorado teachers come from out of state?
- 3) Promising practices
- 4) Timing of reapproval site visits—5 yrs vs. 7 yrs
- 5) State reluctant to give up authority
- 6) Can we narrow down inputs to the "most meaningful" data?
- 7) Teacher identifier number
- 8) 1st and 3rd year teacher survey
- 9) Clear up language for different standards (Teacher Performance Based Standards vs. Model Content Standards vs. endorsement standards)—too confusing

5 aims from the previous meeting:

- 1) Meets requirements
 - Of statute and accreditation agencies
 - Difference between private and public IHEs
 - accountability
- 2) Build institutional capacity
 - Go beyond minimum thresholds to genuine self-study
- 3) Value stakeholders
 - State advocating forward thinking
 - Accountability
- 4) Creativity and Excellence
 - Visits take too much energy that could be productively used elsewhere
- 5) Greater success for students served
 - Multiple impacts and areas for growth

Goals of this committee:

- 1) Streamline approval process
 - Narrow down data inputs to data that will answer "What is it we really want to know?"
- 2) Evaluate which data points are worth collecting
 - Look to Louisiana's passport system?
 - 1st and 3rd year survey varies by IHE so difficult to compare results, make conclusions

- 3) Communication
- 4) Advocate higher education to legislature and support one another

Ken's points:

- 1) Ensure high quality teacher preparation programs produce graduates who teach in ways that promote academic success for K12 students
- 2) Meet legal requirements
- 3) Support the pursuit of operational and academic excellence for higher ed & K12
- 4) Add value to individuals, customers, institutions (K12 and higher ed) and society

What do we need now to move on?

- 1) What information will be collected with the Teacher Identifier Number and how/where can that data be plugged into the current review/approval process? (Jami Goetz will work on this)
- 2) What is the overlap between state and national processes? Can we align them where possible/feasible? (Ian Macgillivray and Carolyn Edwards are attending the NCATE/AACTE Workshop in September 2008 and will collect info on this and bring it to the October 2008 CCODE retreat at Auraria Campus. Also, Nella Bea Anderson handed out a "side-by-side" comparison of Colorado Teacher Education Performance Measures and TEAC.)
- 3) Along with #2 above, Ian will try to set up a meeting for Shari Francis and Donna Gollnick of NCATE to visit Colorado and meet with this committee to answer questions about:
 - Choices: small vs. private vs. public—are there different processes?
 - Accreditation for online institutions
 - What is NCATE/TEAC's "vision?" Where do they want to go and why?
- 4) Eduventures: data on successful programs and best practices (Suzie Perry will work on this)

Miscellaneous:

Information on the approval and reapproval processes, including 5 year site visits, can be found at www.cde.state.co.us/edprepprogram/epp_index.htm and <http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/TeacherEd/>

Next meeting:

Thursday, November 6, 2008, 1:00-3:00pm, Colorado Department of Higher Education, Conference Room A.